



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/733,916	02/20/2001	Eran Aharonson	P-3291-US	3792

7590 03/16/2006

PEARL, COHEN, ZEDEK & LATZER, LLP
10 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
SUITE 1001
NEW YORK, NY 10020

EXAMINER

MARIAM, DANIEL G

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2625

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/733,916

Applicant(s)

AHARONSON, ERAN

Examiner

DANIEL G. MARIAM

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6 and 7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6 and 7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

1. In response to the Office Action mailed on August 31, 2005, applicants have submitted an amendment filed on January 3, 2006, amending independent claim 1.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 6 and 7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skinner (6,661,920).

With regard to claim 1, Skinner discloses a handwriting recognition input system (See for example, Fig. 6) comprising:

a (single) handwriting input area (See for example, item 105, 310 and/or 410, in Figs. 2 and 6-7); and a plurality of activatable controls (which correspond to item 106a and 106b, for example) each being associated with a different reference library, i.e., alphabetic character, numeric character and punctuation character, and each configured to recognizing characters input on said handwriting input area as belonging to said associated reference library (when numeric data is entered, region 2 or 106b will be activated and the numeric data entered by a user will be recognized as numbers, and if on the other hand, an alphabet is entered region would be activated and recognized as letters) (See Figs. 2 and 6-7; and col. 7, line 41 – col. 8, line 6). It would have

Art Unit: 2625

been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the two handwriting areas taught by Skinner by having a single handwriting input area, since applicant has not disclosed that having a single handwriting input area solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the two handwriting input areas would perform equally well with any number of input areas.

With regard to claim 2, a handwriting recognition input system according to claim wherein at least one of said plurality of activatable controls is a software control (See for example, item 315, in Fig. 6).

With regard to claim 3, a handwriting recognition input system according to claim 1, wherein at least one of said plurality of activatable controls is a hardware control (See item 106, in Figs. 2 and 6).

With regard to claim 6, - A personal digital assistant, i.e., portable or palmtop computer, having a handwriting recognition input system according to claim 1 (See Figs. 1-3).

2. Claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skinner (6,661,920) in view of Wecker, et al. (6,289,464).

With regard to claim 1, Skinner discloses a handwriting recognition input system (See for example, Fig. 6) comprising:

a (single) handwriting input area (See for example, item 105, 310 and/or 410, in Figs. 2 and 6-7); and a plurality of activatable controls (which correspond to item 106a and 106b, for example) each being associated with a different reference library, i.e., alphabetic character, numeric character and punctuation character, and each configured to recognizing characters input on said handwriting input area as belonging to said associated reference library (when numeric data is entered, region 2 or 106b will be activated and the numeric data entered by a user will be

Art Unit: 2625

recognized as numbers, and if on the other hand, an alphabet is entered region would be activated and recognized as letters) (See Figs. 2 and 6-7; and col. 7, line 41 – col. 8, line 6). It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the two handwriting areas taught by Skinner by having a single handwriting input area, since applicant has not disclosed that having a single handwriting input area solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the two handwriting input areas would perform equally well with any number of input areas. Skinner does not expressly call for a single handwriting input area. However, Wecker, et al (See for example, Item 42, in Fig. 4) teaches this feature.

Skinner and Wecker, et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, i.e., handwriting recognition (See col. 6, line s 40-51). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Skinner with Wecker, et al. The motivation for doing so is to recognize handwritten alphanumeric characters using a single handwriting input area (See col. 6, lines 34-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wecker, et al. with Skinner to obtain the invention as specified in claim 34.

With regard to claim 2, a handwriting recognition input system according to claim wherein at least one of said plurality of activatable controls is a software control (See for example, item 315, in Fig. 6).

With regard to claim 3, a handwriting recognition input system according to claim 1, wherein at least one of said plurality of activatable controls is a hardware control (See item 106, in Figs. 2 and 6).

With regard to claim 6, - A personal digital assistant, i.e., portable or palmtop computer,

Art Unit: 2625

having a handwriting recognition input system according to claim 1 (See Figs. 1-3).

3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skinner (6,661,920) in view of Krieter (5,526,411).

With regard to claim 7, Skinner discloses all of the claimed subject matter as already addressed above for claim 1, and the arguments are not repeated herein, but are incorporated by reference. Skinner does not expressly call for a mobile telephone. However, Krieter (col. 4, line 53 – col. 5, line 13) teaches this feature. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching as taught by Krieter into the system of Skinner, and to do so would at least provide an integrated portable phone and personal computing device having a handheld body structure that allows the device to be comfortably held as a telephone receiver (See for example, col. 2, lines 38-41).

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over skinner in view of Wecker, et al. as applied to claims 1-3 and 6 above, and further in view of Krieter (5,526,411).

With regard to claim 7, Skinner (as modified by Wecker, et al) discloses all of the claimed subject matter as already addressed above for claim 1, and the arguments are not repeated herein, but are incorporated by reference. Skinner (as modified by Weker, et al) does not expressly call for a mobile telephone. However, Krieter (col. 4, line 53 – col. 5, line 13) teaches this feature. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching as taught by Krieter into the system of Skinner (as modified by Wecker, et al.), and to do so would at least provide an integrated portable phone and personal computing device having a handheld body structure that allows the device to be comfortably held as a telephone receiver (See for example, col. 2, lines 38-41).

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **DANIEL G. MARIAM** whose telephone number is 571-272-7394. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:00-4:30) **FIRST FRIDAY OFF**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **MATTHEW BELLA** can be reached on 571-272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


DANIEL G MARIAM
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2625

March 13, 2006